UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,937	12/11/2003	William Kress Bodin	AUS920030838US1	8688

34533 7590 01/24/2007
INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER	
FABER, DAVID	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/733,937
Filing Date: December 11, 2003
Appellant(s): BODIN ET AL.

Thomas D. Fortenberry
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11 December 2003 appealing from the Office action mailed 1 June 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

20020138331	Hosea et al	9-2002
6269336	Ladd et al	7-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-14, 19-20, and 22-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001).

As per independent Claim 1, Hosea et al discloses a method:

- identifying a presentation document for a presentation, the presentation document including a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers; (Abstract, 4-7; An modified version of an HTML file is considered an presentation document. The structured document is the original HTML file. Paragraph 0043, line 1-5 disclose that a profile of the HTML file of the requested web page is formed of constituent components that include content component and formatting components wherein includes classifications of the content. Paragraph 0045, lines 14-16 discloses HTML file and its HTML profile combined being as one file, as in one document.)
- identifying a user participant for the presentation, the user having a user profile comprising user classifications; and (e.g. Paragraph 0041, lines 5-14; Paragraph 0048; In addition Paragraph 0043;0046-0047: Discloses the use of a user profile that contains user preferences that include demographic and psychographic data. Paragraph 0042 describes how user preferences are generated.)

- filtering the structured document in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers to create a session document. (Paragraph 0046-0047 discloses the use of the HTML file/profile and user profile by comparing the classifications of each content component with the user preferences to create a modified personalized web page.)

However, Hosea et al fails to disclose that the presentation document includes presentation grammar. On the other hand, Ladd et al discloses the use of voice grammar on a markup language document by using a voice browser. Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications. (Column 15, lines 60-64) In addition, the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). With the use of the voice browser application, it fetches the markup language document for user interaction. (Column 13, line 66 – Column 14, line 9) The voice browser collects user input and determines the grammar for user's speech recognition. It determines if a pre-determined grammar exists for the input and markup language. Once the grammar been found, it's sent to the VRU server recognize the user input by comparing the grammar to the user input. (Column 14, lines 10-42; FIG 5) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the use of a detection unit that compares audio inputs to the grammar stored in database. The detector monitors the inputs for key phrases or word, which is then sent to VRU for responses to the said key phrase. (Column 10, lines 12-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

As per dependent Claim 2, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose that identifying a presentation document includes inserting in a list a location for the presentation document. However, Hosea et al discloses that web servers host web sites that support HTML files in the form of web page and documents where in a network path to the site or page supported by a server that is identified by a URL. (Paragraph 0030) In addition, Hosea et al disclose that when a client accesses a web server through the Internet, the client connects through a ISP P.O.P. server that captures URL page requests from client machines for use in user profiling and distribute retrieved Web pages to users. (Paragraph 0030) It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that when the P.O.P. server captured the URL page request, it would have been saved to a data structure, such as a database, wherein the database would list all the URL page requests stored indicating the location of the HTML page or document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with the disclosure above since it would have a provided the user a history of previous accessed URLs on locating a particular document previously viewed.

As per dependent Claim 4, Hosea et al discloses a method:

- extracting, from the structured document, structural elements having classification identifiers corresponding to the user classifications; and writing the extracted structural elements into a session structured document in the session document. (Paragraph 0043, lines 14-15 discloses that the HTML file is parsed to extract the constituent components, which include content components (Paragraph 0043, lines 5-7), and analyzing and rating the content components. Then, Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, discloses uses the classification of each content component from the HTML profile/file to analyze its relevance to the requesting user wherein Paragraph 0046 discloses the process of comparing the components to the interest of the user and is either eliminated, rearranged, or new content may be added. Thus, a new modified Web page is created with the included components by the user preferences (Paragraph 0047))

As per dependent Claim 5, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose that filtering the presentation grammar, in dependence upon the extracted structural elements, into a session grammar in the session document. However, Hosea et al discloses that the voice browser determines if pre-determined grammar or pre-existing grammar is contained in the markup language. (Column 14, lines 18-20) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls

for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64) and the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). Ladd et al's method of structural elements that contain voice commands, navigational controls, or voice place markers in a markup language can be incorporated into the structural components of Hosea et al's method allowing the creation of the modified HTML file in Hosea et al's that only contains voice elements to its relevant components, which links to the corresponding selected grammar, thus filtering out the grammar of the presentation document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

As per independent Claim 10, Claim 10 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 10 is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per independent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites a computer program product for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 19 is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al. Furthermore, Hosea et al discloses a recording medium (Page 7, Claim 45: memory for storing programs)

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 23, Claim 23 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

5. Claims 3, 12, and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Carter (US Patent #5,787,175, patented 7/28/1998).

As per dependent Claim 3, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose that identifying a user includes inserting in a list a user identification identifying a user in a presentation participant list. However, Carter discloses the use of adding a user to an access control list that would enable a user to access that document and other control rights. (Column 3, lines 25-42)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Carter method's since

Carter's method would have provided a method for controlling collaborative access to a work group document by the users.

As per dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Carter.

As per dependent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Carter.

6. Claims 6, 15, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Felciano et al (US Patent #6,052,730)

As per dependent Claim 6, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose storing the location of the session document in a session document list. However, Hosea et al discloses the client receives the modified HTML file through the POP server for viewing by the user using the client browser. (Paragraph 0049) However, Felciano et al discloses that each document sent to the client, the original URL is modified before it is sent to the client. (Abstract, lines 10-15) Felciano et al discloses with the use of a gateway server using a CGI script called Lamprey in which Lamprey replaces every original URL in the requested document with a modified URL and returns the modified document to the client. (Column 5, lines 6-10) Thus, it was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that when a browser loads an

HTML file or other pages, the URL is saved into a history list by the browser indicting the location of the modified document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Felciano et al's method since Felciano et al method's would have provided a method on monitoring web browsing activates.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Felciano et al.

As per dependent Claim 24, Claim 24 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Felciano et al.

7. Claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Huang (US PGPub 2001/0032218, published 10/18/2001)

As per dependent claim 7, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document. However, Ladd et al discloses the use of creating a markup language that document having a plurality of elements, that include markup tags, wherein elements describe the structure of the document, provide pronunciation of words and phrases, and place markers in the text to

control interactive voice services, such as controlling phrasing, emphasis, pitch, and speaking rate. (Column 16, lines 5-20) The markup language also includes input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64). Using an voice browser application to interrupt the markup language document, a grammar is dynamically created if a pre-existing grammar is not found in a stored database, and once generated it is sent to the VRU server. (Column 14, lines 18-42)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

Furthermore, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute. However, Huang discloses a method for converting unstructured documents into structured documents. (Abstract, lines 1-3) In addition, Huang discloses an identifier is assigned to each document element that may include a name, font, type name, or a color where the identifier is in data of each of the document elements. (Paragraph 0050, lines 5-7) In addition, FIG. 7 discloses the arranging of character data within classification element tags, such as ingredient, wherein each of the data elements for the character data contains element presentation attributes for font types and font colors. (FIG. 7, 706)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 8, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element; identifying a classification identifier in dependence upon the presentation attribute; and inserting the classification identifier in association with the structural element in the structured document. However, Huang discloses using an association table (FIG. 5; Paragraph 0067, Page 6, lines 3-6) for the document elements defined in a desired DTD and associated font attributes which parses the input document into data elements and its assigned font attributes. (Paragraph 0067) FIG. 6 discloses an editing result for the unstructured document in which each parsed data elements are assigned with font attributes that also involves region grouping of data elements. Hence, ingredient elements are grouped together, and so are procedure elements. In correlation with the association table, the grouped elements are identified under one element, such as ingredient, and are inserted during the converting of the structured document. FIG 7 discloses the insertion of element tags with each of its assigned attributes, which were assigned when the document was parsed, in which the use of mapping rules converted documents into a structured document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with

Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 9, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document. On the other hand, Ladd et al discloses selecting a grammar from a pre-determined/existing grammar stored in a database or in the markup language based on the user inputs. (Column 14, lines 18-42) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64) and the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). Ladd et al's method of structural elements that contain voice commands, navigational controls, or voice place markers in a markup language can be incorporated into the structural components of Hosea et al's method allowing the creation of the modified HTML file in Hosea et al's that only contains voice elements to its relevant components, which links to the corresponding selected grammar, thus filtering out the grammar of the presentation document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

Furthermore, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose identifying the content type of the original document. However, Huang discloses stating the unstructured document (Paragraph 0035, lines 8-12) is printed to a metafile format, mostly commonly Portable Data Format, so the metafile format can be opened or read identically in many different environments. (Paragraph 0043) It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that when converting the unstructured document into a metafile for conversion purposes, the program doing the conversion is able to read and understand the data format, able to identify the content type of the unstructured document and able to transfer the content into a metafile format.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 26, Claim 26 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

(10) Response to Argument

In regards to Appellant's arguments on pages 8-12 in reference to Claim 1, Appellant argues the combination of Hosea and Ladd does not teach or suggest identify a presentation document for a presentation, the presentation document including a presentation grammar and a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers. Appellant argues that Hosea or Ladd does not disclose a presentation grammar wherein a presentation grammar is a data structure that includes a set of key phrases used to identify presentation action identifiers and optional parameters for use in formulating presentation control instructions relevant to structural elements of a content type. In addition, Appellant argues that Hosea or Ladd does not contain structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers wherein a classification identifier identifies a class of user participants authorized to view a structural element in a presentation document. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *a presentation grammar wherein a presentation grammar is a data structure that*

includes a set of key phrases used to identify presentation action identifiers and optional parameters for use in formulating presentation control instructions relevant to structural elements of a content type and *a classification identifier identifies a class of user participants authorized to view a structural element in a presentation document*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Since the claim's wording is broad and contains no clear definition of what classification identifiers are defined as leaving it up to various interpretations as Examiner saw fit, Hosea does teach a presentation document for presentation, the presentation document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers. Hosea et al discloses a presentation document for presentation by having a modified document created to be provided to the user, wherein additionally, is viewed to the user (Paragraph 0049, lines 1-3) Therefore, the modified document is presented to the user for viewing making it's a presentation thus making the document for presentation a presentation document. In addition, Hosea et al discloses that the presentation document including a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers. Hosea et al discloses the document used as a presentation document is an HTML file wherein the HTML file, a structured document, is a markup language file that includes content and formatting components. (Paragraph 0043) An HTML file has formatting components to structure the document on how it is viewed, while classification identifiers indicated the content components, coinciding with

the formatting components, if it is a link, image or text string. Paragraph 0043, lines 1-5, and in addition, lines 5-9 discloses HTML file/profile is based on the same or similar content classification scheme to the user profile wherein the user profile includes classifications for the content components of the HTML file, therefore, the HTML file includes classification identifiers of the content.

Furthermore, the Examiner fully agreed in previously Office Action that Hosea et al fails to disclose or teach a presentation document including a presentation grammar. However, since the claim's wording is broad and contains no clear definition of what a presentation grammar is defined as within the claim leaving it up to various interpretations as Examiner saw fit, Ladd et al does discloses a the use of a voice (presentation grammar) on a markup language document that presented by using a voice browser. The voice grammar within a markup language includes text, navigational controls, input controls (wherein one may view as commands) and elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. . In other words, the markup language includes elements for user to input by reciting a phrase to activate that corresponding functionally. Thus, a voice browser is incorporated to use the full functionality of the voice-grammar markup language that allows a user to interactive with the document presented in the browser. Doing so allows the grammar of the markup language be presented to the user when used by the browser as presenting, thus the document presented contains grammar used presentation as stated in Ladd et al's invention. (FIG 5; Column 10, lines 12-20; Column 13, line 66 – Column 14, line 10-42; Column 15, lines 60-64; Column 16, lines 1-4, 11-14)

As stated above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined or modify Hosea et al's method of a creating a presentation document to present with or to include Ladd et al's use of voice-grammar in a markup language document with a voice browser to for the user to interact with the document since would have provided users to access information from an information using voice inputs or commands wherein users can access up-to-date information such as news, weather, traffic etc, and able to perform transactions (Column 2, lines 48-58)

In regards to Appellant's arguments on pages 12-14 in reference to the third element of Claim 1, Appellant argues the combination of Hosea and Ladd does not teach or suggest filtering the structured document in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers to create a session document. Appellant argues classification identifiers are not disclosed by either reference wherein Appellant argues a classification identifier identifies a class of user participants authorized to view a structural element in a presentation document. In addition, Appellant argues either reference does not discloses a session document is created as Appellant argues a session document is a data structure that includes a session grammar derived from a presentation grammar in a presentation document and a session structured document derived from a structured document in a presentation document. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., *a classification identifier identifies a class of user participants authorized to view a structural element in a presentation document* and *a session document is a data structure that includes a session grammar derived from a presentation grammar in a presentation document and a session structured document derived from a structured document in a presentation document*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Since the claim's wording is broad and contains no clear definition of what classification identifiers and a session document are defined as leaving it up to various interpretations as Examiner saw fit, Hosea does disclose filtering the structured document in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers to create a session document. Hosea et al discloses the document generated provides a personalized Web page with the user's interest and preferences for user to view/surf at his time or session at the user's computer when delivered (Abstract; Paragraph 0049).). In addition, Hoses et al teaches filtering the structured document (Paragraph 0046) in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers. As Hosea et al teaches, filtering includes comparing the user profile, which includes the user preferences and interests, and the content components, which are identifiers that are classifications of the content, to determine if a particular interest from the user preferences (classifications) shows a high or low interest when comparing against the content component classifications as disclosed in Paragraph 0046-0047. Based on the

result of the comparison, some of the document content is filtered based on the dependence on the user classifications and the classification identifiers that determined which content appears on the personalized web page that the user views during the viewing session.

In regards to Appellant's arguments on pages 15-17, Appellant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Hosea and Ladd stating Hosea and Ladd fails to discloses any suggestion or motivation from the teachings themselves and that the Examiner failed to explicitly point to the teaching within Hosea or Ladd suggesting the proposed combination. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to Appellant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Examiner disagrees. Hosea discloses creating a modified structured document (web page), presenting information to the user, based on user preferences and content components from an original web page (HTML) document. (e.g. Abstract, Paragraphs 0043-0049) Ladd et al discloses a markup language document containing voice grammar elements used to control interactive voice services, that is presented to the user through a

browser presenting information to the user customized to the user preferences. (e.g. Column 15, lines 60-64; Column 16, lines 1-4, 11-14)

As stated above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined or modify Hosea et al's method of a creating a presentation document to present with or to include Ladd et al's use of voice-grammar in a markup language document presented by a voice browser for the user to interact with the document since it would have provided users to access information from an information using voice inputs or commands wherein users can access up-to-date information such as news, weather, traffic etc, and able to perform transactions (Column 2, lines 48-58) In other words, users are presented with information regarding different subjects based on the presentation of the document customized to the user preferences using voice services.

In response to Appellant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

All other arguments on pages 17-30 referring to the dependent claims and parallel claims are in reference to the topics above, thus the rationale above can be used to respond to the similar arguments.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

David Faber

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Conferees:

Stephen Hong, Supervisory Patent Examiner for Group Art Unit 2178

Heather Herndon, Supervisory Patent Examiner for Group Art Unit 2176